UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/523,517	02/04/2005	Taro Kamiko	INF 2004 LW 2488 US	1666

48154 7590 03/30/2009

SLATER & MATSIL LLP
17950 PRESTON ROAD
SUITE 1000
DALLAS, TX 75252

EXAMINER	
ALSIP, MICHAEL	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2186	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/30/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/523,517	KAMIKO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MICHAEL ALSIP	2186	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 January 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

1. **Claims 1, 3-13 and 16-18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Merrel et al. (US 5,829,038) in view of Brabandt (US 5,809,531), and further in view of The Cache Memory book by Him Handy (Handy).

2. Consider **claim 1**, Merrel et al. discloses a data processing system having: at least one processor chip including a processor unit and an internal data cache (Col. 2 lines 59-65), and an interface external to the internal data cache and which is configured to receive cache mirror data from the processor chip (where the L2-Ln part of the cache hierarchy interfaces the main memory with the CPU and L1 cache (data cache) and receives data to be written from the processor chip), the interface further

configured to discard all the cache mirror data to be written to an external memory received from the processor chip so that cache mirror data is never written to the external memory during operation of the processor chip (Col. 3 lines 46-67 and Col. 4 lines 1-37 where data written back to the cache hierarchy will eventually become a victim line and be evicted (discarded) and if the data line is clean it will be discarded and not written to the external memory), but Merrel does not teach that all the cache mirror data to be written to an external memory received from the processor chip is never written, however Brabandt discloses the ability to have a system where no external memory is needed and therefore no writes to that external memory will ever be needed and therefore never written, even during a flush or eviction (abstract, Col. 1 lines 33-35 and 45-48, Col. 2 lines 1-4 and 32-35 and Col. 4 lines 18-35, the examiner would also like to point out that if there is no data to be written back, as in Brabandt, then there is no data to discard).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was to combine the teachings of Brabandt with Merrel, because Brabandt teaches that the ability to remove the need to rely on an external memory and therefore never write data to an external memory increases the overall performance of the microprocessor itself (Col. 1 lines 22-26).

The combination of Merrel in view of Brabandt does not explicitly disclose the newly added limitation wherein the interface is located outside the first processor chip. The examiner is considering the L2-Ln caches to be the interface, however in Merrel these caches happen to be integrated into the chip, however Handy (pg. 28 ¶'s 2 and 3

and table 1.1 and pg. 89-90 section 2.2.10) discloses that external caches are used in both systems that do and do not have an on-chip cache, the benefits of having additional caches being external rather than internal are reduced costs, reduced die size, and the ability to make up for some of the deficiencies of the on-chip cache, therefore being obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

3. Consider **claim 3**, as applied to **claim 1** above, Merrel et al. in view of Brabandt and Handy discloses a data processing system according to **claim 1** further including one or more further processing chips which have read/write access to external memory (Merrel et al.: Col. 2 lines 16-17, Col. 5 lines 22-26).

4. Consider **claim 4**, Merrel et al. discloses a method of operating a processing chip having a processor, an internal data cache and a cache controller for transmitting cache mirror data write instructions out of the processor chip (Col. 2 lines 60-65, Col. 3 lines 25-34), the method including discarding the write instructions so that cache mirror data is never written to an external memory during the operation of the processing chip (Col. 3 lines 46-67 and Col. 4 lines 1-37, where the write back instructions are canceled (discarded) if in the cache hierarchy there exists associated cache line in a lower level cache is clean) the external interface providing a connection between the processing chip and an address controller (Fig. 1 component 60, since the memory sub-system is able to receive an address signal from the cache and use that to access and manipulate it's memory, there must be logic in the memory sub-system that controls the address information that it receives and therefore has an address controller) and arranging for the program code operated by the processor to require only the data cache as memory

(The purpose of the cache and control of the cache (replacement policy) is to reduce the amount of times the processor needs to access slower memory to retrieve its desired data by keeping as much of the require program data as possible in the cache, therefore if the program being run is only as big as the cache the program will use only the cache as its memory), but Merrel does not teach that all the cache mirror data to be written to an external memory received from the processor chip is never written, however Brabandt discloses the ability to have a system where no external memory is needed and therefore no writes to that external memory will ever be needed and therefore never written, even during a flush or eviction (abstract, Col. 1 lines 33-35 and 45-48, Col. 2 lines 1-4 and 32-35 and Col. 4 lines 18-35, the examiner would also like to point out that if there is no data to be written back, as in Brabandt, then there is no data to discard).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was to combine the teachings of Brabandt with Merrel, because Brabandt teaches that the ability to remove the need to rely on an external memory and therefore never write data to an external memory increases the overall performance of the microprocessor itself (Col. 1 lines 22-26).

The combination of Merrel in view of Brabandt does not explicitly disclose the newly added limitation wherein the interface is located outside the first processor chip. The examiner is considering the L2-Ln caches to be the interface, however in Merrel these caches happen to be integrated into the chip, however Handy (pg. 28 ¶'s 2 and 3 and table 1.1 and pg. 89-90 section 2.2.10) discloses that external caches are used in

both systems that do and do not have an on-chip cache, the benefits of having additional caches being external rather than internal are reduced costs, reduced die size, and the ability to make up for some of the deficiencies of the on-chip cache, therefore being obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

5. Consider **claim 5**, as applied to **claim 1** above, Merrel et al. in view of Brabandt and Handy discloses a data processing system according to **claim 1**, wherein the at least one processor chip comprises exactly one processor chip (Merrel et al.: Fig. 1).

6. Consider **claim 6**, as applied to **claim 1** above, Merrel et al. in view of Brabandt and Handy discloses a data processing system according to **claim 1**, wherein the at least one processor chip comprises two processor chips (Merrel et al.: Col. 2 lines 16-17, Col. 5 lines 22-26).

7. Consider **claims 7**, as applied to **claim 1** above, Merrel et al. in view of Brabandt and Handy discloses a data processing system according to **claim 1**, but does not explicitly disclose wherein the processor chip further includes an internal cache controller coupled between the internal data cache and the processor unit whereas Handy does teach this feature (Handy: Fig. 2.4 pages 42-49, all CPU/cache interactions are controlled by the cache controller which must intercept all of the CPU's signals).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the cache controller between the internal data cache and processor unit in the system of Merrel et al., because Handy teaches that all CPU/cache interactions are controlled by the cache controller which must intercept all of the CPU's

signals, therefore it would be obvious for the cache controller to be between the internal data cache and processor unit (Handy: Fig. 2.4 pages 42-49).

8. Consider **claim 8**, Merrel et al. discloses a data processing system comprising: a processor chip including an internal processor coupled to an internal data cache (Col. 2 lines 59-65); an external memory (Fig. 1); and an interface external to the internal data cache coupled between the processor chip and the external memory, the interface configured to receive memory data from the external memory and transfer the memory data to the processor chip (where the L2-Ln part of the cache hierarchy interfaces the main memory with the CPU and L1 cache(data cache) and receives data to be written from the processor chip, the claim language does not require that the interface be external to the processor chip, but instead that it is external to the data cache and therefore the L2-Ln part of the cache hierarchy is considered the interface between the processor and data cache combination and the external memory), the interface further configured to receive internal cache mirror data from the processor chip and discard all the internal cache mirror data to be written to the external memory so that the internal cache mirror data is never written to an external memory (Col. 3 lines 46-67 and Col. 4 lines 1-37 where data written back to the cache hierarchy will eventually become a victim line and be evicted (discarded) and if the data line is clean it will be discarded and not written to the external memory), but Merrel does not teach that all the cache mirror data to be written to an external memory received from the processor chip is never written, however Brabandt discloses the ability to have a system where no external memory is needed and therefore no writes to that external memory will ever be needed

and therefore never written, even during a flush or eviction (abstract, Col. 1 lines 33-35 and 45-48, Col. 2 lines 1-4 and 32-35 and Col. 4 lines 18-35, the examiner would also like to point out that if there is no data to be written back, as in Brabandt, then there is no data to discard).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was to combine the teachings of Brabandt with Merrel, because Brabandt teaches that the ability to remove the need to rely on an external memory and therefore never write data to an external memory increases the overall performance of the microprocessor itself (Col. 1 lines 22-26).

The combination of Merrel in view of Brabandt does not explicitly disclose the newly added limitation wherein the interface is located outside the first processor chip. The examiner is considering the L2-Ln caches to be the interface, however in Merrel these caches happen to be integrated into the chip, however Handy (pg. 28 ¶'s 2 and 3 and table 1.1 and pg. 89-90 section 2.2.10) discloses that external caches are used in both systems that do and do not have an on-chip cache, the benefits of having additional caches being external rather than internal are reduced costs, reduced die size, and the ability to make up for some of the deficiencies of the on-chip cache, therefore being obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

The combination of Merrel in view of Brabandt does not explicitly disclose the newly added limitation wherein there is an address decoder, however Handy does teach the use of an address decoder (Handy: Fig. 5.5, pages 196-197) and for the limitation that the interface provides the only connection between the processor chip and the

address decoder, (Merrel: fig. 1 and Handy: Fig. 5.5, pages 196-197, Handy discloses have the address decoder as part of the control circuit for the cache, which the examiner is interpreting the cache memory and its control circuitry of the L2-Ln cache of Merrel as the interface, and therefore making the interface the only connection to the address controller which is part of the interface).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have a decoder in the control circuit in the system of Merrel et al., because Handy teaches that using a decoder with the control circuit for the cache reduces delays in determining cache hits and misses (page 196-197).

9. Consider **claim 9**, as applied to **claim 8** above, Merrel et al. in view of Brabandt and Handy discloses a data processing system according to **claim 8**, further comprising a control circuit coupled to the interface circuit, the control circuit providing a control signal to indicate whether data received by the interface should be discarded (the cache controllers for each cache in the hierarchy are the control circuits which contain the algorithms for determining which data is moved in and out of cache (cache replacement policy), including the eviction (discarding) of data in the cache).

10. Consider **claim 10**, as applied to **claim 9** above, Merrel et al. in view of Brabandt and Handy discloses a data processing system according to **claim 9**, wherein the control circuit comprises a decoder (Handy: Fig. 5.5, pages 196-197).

11. Consider **claim 11**, as applied to **claim 8** above, Merrel et al. in view of Brabandt and Handy discloses a data processing system according to **claim 8**, further comprising: a second processor chip that includes an internal processor coupled to an

internal cache; and a second interface, wherein the second processor chip is coupled to the external memory through the second interface (Fig. 1, Col. 2 lines 16-17, Col. 5 lines 22-26, where each processor in the multi-processor cluster will have the same configuration as in fig. 1).

12. Consider **claim 12**, as applied to **claim 11** above, Merrel et al. in view of Brabandt and Handy discloses a data processing system according to **claim 11**, further comprising a system bus coupled to the processor chip, the second processor chip, the interface, and the second interface (Fig. 1, Col. 2 lines 16-17, Col. 3 lines 24-34, Col. 5 lines 22-26, wherein in a cluster the databus will be used in the same fashion as per the embodiment described).

13. Consider **claim 13**, as applied to **claim 12** above, Merrel et al. in view of Brabandt and Handy discloses a data processing system according to **claim 12**, further comprising a third processor chip coupled to the system bus (Fig. 1, Col. 2 lines 16-17, Col. 5 lines 22-26).

14. Consider **claim 16**, Merrel et al. discloses a method of operating a data processing system having a plurality of integrated circuits, each integrated circuit having a processor, an internal data cache, and a cache controller (Col. 2 lines 16-17 and 60-65, Col. 3 lines 25-34, Col. 5 lines 22-26), the method comprising: transmitting cache mirror data write instructions from a first cache controller of a first integrated circuit to an external memory interface (Fig. 1, where the L2-Ln part of the cache hierarchy interfaces the main memory with the CPU and L1 cache(data cache) and receives data to be written from the processor chip, the cache hierarchy is considered the interface

between the processor and data cache combination and the external memory); and discarding the first cache mirror data write instructions at the external memory interface so that cache mirror data is never written to external memory during operation of the first processor (Col. 3 lines 46-67 and Col. 4 lines 1-37 where data written back to the cache hierarchy will eventually become a victim line and be evicted (discarded) and if the data line is clean it will be discarded and not written to the external memory), but Merrel does not teach that all the cache mirror data to be written to an external memory received from the processor chip is never written, however Brabandt discloses the ability to have a system where no external memory is needed and therefore no writes to that external memory will ever be needed and therefore never written, even during a flush or eviction (abstract, Col. 1 lines 33-35 and 45-48, Col. 2 lines 1-4 and 32-35 and Col. 4 lines 18-35, the examiner would also like to point out that if there is no data to be written back, as in Brabandt, then there is no data to discard).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was to combine the teachings of Brabandt with Merrel, because Brabandt teaches that the ability to remove the need to rely on an external memory and therefore never write data to an external memory increases the overall performance of the microprocessor itself (Col. 1 lines 22-26).

The combination of Merrel in view of Brabandt does not explicitly disclose wherein the external memory interface is located outside the first integrated circuit. The examiner is considering the L2-Ln caches to be the interface, however in Merrel these caches happen to be integrated into the chip, however Handy (pg. 28 ¶'s 2 and 3 and

table 1.1 and pg. 89-90 section 2.2.10) discloses that external caches are used in both systems that do and do not have an on-chip cache, the benefits of having additional caches being external rather than internal are reduced costs, reduced die size, and the ability to make up for some of the deficiencies of the on-chip cache, therefore being obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Consider **claim 17**, as applied to **claim 16** above, Merrel et al. in view of Brabandt and Handy disclose further comprising: transmitting second cache mirror data write instructions from a second cache controller in a second integrated circuit to the external memory interface; writing the second cache mirror data write instructions from the external memory interface to external memory (Merrel et al.: Col. 2 lines 16-17, Col. 5 lines 22-26 and Handy pg. 140 ¶ 2, where Merrel discloses a multiprocessor system and Handy discloses the ability to share the lower level caches (interface) with multiple processors and Merrel discloses the ability to write data to the external memory).

Consider **claim 18**, as applied to **claim 17** above, Merrel et al. in view of Brabandt and Handy disclose further comprising: determining if a task requires a read/write memory that is larger than an internal data cache size; and allocating the task to the first integrated circuit or to the second integrated circuit based upon the determining step (Brabandt abstract, the examiner considers the term “task” to only be a single instruction and the act of loading an instruction into a cache line means that it has been determined that the instruction does not need a larger memory and the act of loading also means that a circuit in the system has been allocated).

15. **Claim 2** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Merrel et al. (US 5,829,038) in view of Brabandt (US 5,809,531) and Handy as applied to **claim 1** above, and further in view of Klein (6,401,199 B1).

16. Consider **claim 2**, as applied to **claim 1** above, Merrel et al. in view of Brabandt and Handy disclose a data processing system according to **claim 1** in which the interface is coupled to a memory (Merrel et al: Col. 2 lines 59-65), but Merrel does not explicitly state that the interface passing data to the processor chip during initialization, whereas Klein does teach this (Klein: abstract Col. 1 lines 22-63).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the processor chip initialize through the cache hierarchy interface of Merrel, because Klein teaches that running the bootstrap programs from RAM instead of ROM is faster and also the use of ROM to hold initialization data at start-up is well-known because the data is not lost when the system is shutdown (Klein: Col. 1 lines 22-63).

17. **Claims 14 and 15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Merrel et al. (US 5,829,038) in view of Brabandt (US 5,809,531) and Handy as applied to **claim 13** above, and further in view of Stewart et al. (US 5,157,780).

18. Consider **claim 14**, as applied to **claim 13** above, Merrel et al. in view of Brabandt and Handy discloses a data processing system according to **claim 13**, but does not explicitly state the system of **claim 13** wherein the third processor chip comprises a master processing unit and wherein the processor chip and the second

processor chip comprise slave processing units, whereas Stewart et al. does teach this feature (Fig. 1, Col. 1 lines 13-18).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have a plurality of processors implemented in a master/slave configuration in the system of Merrel et al., because Stewart et al. teaches that it is common to use redundant processors to provide a fail-safe mode of operation (Col. 1 lines 13-18).

19. Consider **claim 15**, as applied to **claim 14** above, Merrel et al. in view of Brabandt and Handy discloses a data processing system according to **claim 14**, further comprising a second external memory directly coupled to the system bus. (The examiner is taking official notice to the fact that it is well-known and common in the art that computer systems have a type of ROM connected to the system bus for BIOS or initialization of the system upon start-up).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have a second external memory coupled to the system bus in the system of Merrel et al., because it is notoriously well-known and common in the art to have ROM connected to the system bus to initialize a processing system upon start-up.

Response to Arguments

20. Applicant's arguments filed 1/14/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

21. The Applicant first argues, with respect to **claims 1, 4, 8 and 16**, that Brabandt and Merrel cannot be combined because Brabandt states that “it is an object of the

present invention to provide a microprocessor with an on-chip cache with no dependency upon external RAM subsystem during power-up" and because of this statement Brabandt teaches away from the limitation: "an interface external to the internal data cache and external to the processor chip, and configured to receive cache mirror data from the processor chip". However this statement made in the disclosure of Brabandt does not exclude any external interfaces that can receive cache mirror data, but rather that the microprocessor is not dependent on an external RAM during *power-up.* This statement also does not exclude the use of an external RAM at all times or even during power-up, but rather that the microprocessor can perform its operations without the RAM during power-up if need be. Therefore this combination of references is a valid combination.

22. The Applicant also argues, with respect to **claims 1, 4, 8 and 16**, Brabandt does not teach discarding cache mirror data to be written to an external memory. Merrel et al. discloses a system with a processor chip with a multilevel cache within the chip and an external main memory subsystem and when data is to be replaced in the multilevel cache, older cache lines are evicted. In situations where the older cache lines are clean, the old cache lines are evicted without any write backs, but in situations where older cache lines are modified and not found in lower level caches, the older cache lines are evicted and written back. Handy is used to disclose that multilevel caches do not need to be entirely integrated into the cache chip, but rather that some levels of the hierarchy can be external to the processor chip as well. Brabandt is bought in to disclose a processor chip that can run programs that do not require an external main memory

subsystem, but rather can run only from a cache memory of the system. The claim language states that cache mirror data is never written to the external memory, which this combination discloses. It appears as though the Applicant is taking the claim language "cache mirror data to be written to an external memory" to mean that the data has some kind of designation, however, in the present state of the claims, either the data is written too or its not too an external memory and the claim language states that the cache mirror data is never written to an external memory. It is possible for any data stored in the lower level cache memory's (which is considered the external interface) to be written to an external main memory, if one is present in the system, however ultimately the claim language states that data is never written to the external memory, which the combination of Merrel, Handy and Brabandt disclose. If the phrase "to be written to an external memory" is meant to refer to data that is designated (by a flag bit for example) to be written to an external memory, then later somehow loses this designation by some process and then is discarded without the data ever being written to the external memory, then this type of language should be added to the claim language. The examiner is considering any data that is present in the lower levels of the cache of Merrel to meet the claim language of "data to be written to an external memory".

Conclusion

23. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL ALSIP whose telephone number is (571)270-1182. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matt Kim can be reached on 571-272-4182. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michael Alsip
Examiner
Art Unit 2186

/Michael Alsip/
Examiner, Art Unit 2186

March 24, 2009

/Pierre-Michel Bataille/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2186